



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

strengthened the cause of arbitration. The Drago doctrine, pure and simple, was not approved, though ably presented by its author, Dr. Drago, himself, but the Conference adopted a convention, prepared by General Horace Porter of the United States Delegation, providing that force should not be used in the collection of contractual debts from a debtor nation, until the justice of the claim should first be submitted to arbitration, or until arbitration should be refused by the debtor state. As it is not likely that any debtor nation would ever refuse to arbitrate a case of this kind, this Convention means substantially that obligatory arbitration has been extended to all that class of international disputes involving money indemnities. These disputes are, of course, not among the most important that arise between nations, but they are often very troublesome and annoying, frequently creating prejudice and ill-will; and the bringing of them by conventional agreement into the field of obligatory arbitration is certainly a great triumph for the principle for which we contend.

The failure of the Conference to give us a general treaty of obligatory arbitration is being made up in part by the continuation of the conclusion of treaties of arbitration between the nations in pairs. Before the Hague Conference closed two treaties of this type were signed at The Hague, one between Italy and the Argentine Republic and the other between Italy and Mexico. Since the close of the Conference, our own government, acting on the recommendation of the Conference, has taken up again the work begun by the late Secretary Hay and has already concluded treaties with Great Britain, France, Norway, Sweden, Italy, Mexico, Denmark, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, The Netherlands and Japan. Adding these twelve treaties, all of which have been ratified by the Senate, to those previously concluded within the past four years and a half, we have at the present time no less than sixty-one of these treaties between the nations, two and two, already in force.

The most of these treaties run for five years and stipulate reference to the Hague Court only of questions of a judicial order and those arising in the application and interpretation of existing treaties. Two of them — those between Denmark and The Netherlands and Denmark and Italy — are without limitation of any kind. They refer all questions of all kinds for all time to the Hague Court. The treaty between Norway and Sweden runs for ten years, and has the special provision that in case a dispute is by either nation conceived to involve the question of vital interest or national honor, this preliminary question shall first be submitted to the Hague Court. In the rest of these treaties, questions of vital interest, national honor and national independence are reserved.

On this line the new treaties which Secretary Root is negotiating are drawn. These new treaties provide that the Senate, as a part of the treaty-making power, shall pass upon the agreement for submission before it goes into force. They also stipulate that the other government, party to the treaty, shall not be bound until the special agreement for the reference of a dispute shall have been passed upon by our Senate. The President has yielded to the Senate in the matter which caused the failure of the Hay Treaties to go into effect. It is understood that our government is to continue the negotiation

of these treaties, until, if possible, it has concluded agreements with all the governments of the world.

I must not neglect to mention in this *resumé* the results of the Central American Conference held in Washington a little time ago. In the treaties formulated at that Conference and since accepted by the five interested governments, especially in the Convention providing for the setting up of a regular Central American Court of Justice, the principle of the judicial settlement of controversies between states has been carried further toward ultimate completeness than in any other quarter. How much stability this remarkable compact will have it is too early yet to say; but we shall all hope that it will not have to encounter the storms of passion and small politics which have so often swept over that region and wrecked all schemes for settled order and peace.

One further matter, to complete the summary of what the year has done for the advancement of arbitration. As is well known to all, our government and that of Great Britain have reached an agreement, the details of which are being gradually worked out, for the submission of the whole Newfoundland-Labrador fisheries dispute to the Court at The Hague. This is a very important agreement, and the result of it will be, without doubt, to remove from the field of controversy a question which, practically ever since the foundation of our government, has been frequently the occasion of misunderstanding and more or less bad feeling among those directly interested in the Newfoundland fishing industry.

Looking at the subject in general, therefore, — from all points of view, — from the point of view of the successes and general influence of the second Hague Conference, the strengthening of the Hague Court, the special application of obligatory arbitration provided for by the convention on contractual claims, the provision that any government wishing to arbitrate a controversy with an unwilling opponent may go directly to the Bureau of the Hague Court and ask through the Bureau for the arbitration of the case; from the point of view also of the increase in the number of arbitration treaties between the nations, two and two, and from that of the Newfoundland fisheries submission, — it is clear that the cause of arbitration has gained greatly increased strength and made substantial progress during the year.

Perhaps more important still than any of these special attainments is the fact that the people of all classes, in the different countries, are more universally and more unitedly than ever before determined that arbitration, and not war, shall be the uniform method of disposing of such controversies as may hereafter arise between nations, which cannot be adjusted through the regular channels of diplomacy. It is this widespread popular support of the movement, and not any particular attainments in the way of conferences and conventions, important as these are, that after all constitutes our surest ground for hope of an early realization of the high ideal for which this Mohonk gathering stands.

Economic Facts for Practical People.

BY LUCIA AMES MEAD.

The cost of a first-class battleship equals the valuation of all the land and the one hundred buildings Harvard University has accumulated in two hundred and fifty

years plus all the land and buildings of Hampton and Tuskegee Institutes. A modern battleship becomes practically useless in fifteen years.

We have fought European foes only three years in the one hundred and twenty-four years since the Revolution. In every foreign war we made the first attack. With less danger from attack than any other nation, we are now spending more for past war and preparation for future war than any other nation in the world.

1. Since 1800 our population has increased twenty-two times. Our expenditure for armaments has increased two hundred and twenty times, while our danger has diminished.

2. We are spending sixty-five per cent. of our national revenue for armaments, pensions and interest on war debts, and have only one-third for Congress, the judicial and executive departments, coastguard, lighthouses, quarantine, customs, post-offices, census, waterways, forestry, consular and diplomatic service and all other constructive work of the national government.

3. In four years we have killed by accident, largely preventable, eighty thousand more persons than perished by bullets on both sides in four years of civil war. Every year we destroy vastly more life and property by the internal enemies—ignorance, preventable disease and crime—than in all our six years of war with foreign powers. We are blind to the enemies at home and show an ignoble fear of suppositious enemies abroad who have never attacked us or shown ill feeling towards us. Were we to put our taxes into the improvements of education, commerce and agriculture, instead of into explosives and new battleships, we should do a thousand times more for real defense.

4. Our agreement with Great Britain in 1817 to remove forts and battleships on our three thousand miles of northern frontier ensured peace and thereby saved hundreds of millions of dollars in needless defense.

5. A million dollar bills packed solidly like leaves in a book make a pile two hundred and seventy-five feet high. One thousand million dollars—less than Europe's annual expenditure for armaments in time of peace—equal a pile of dollar bills over fifty-two miles high. This sum also represents one thousand million days' labor at a dollar a day. A second pile of dollar bills over fifty-two miles high represents Europe's annual payment for interest and other cost of past wars.

6. To these sums, which transcend human power to imagine, must be added the lost earnings of the millions of able-bodied men in European armies and navies who are thus made nonproductive, while the women in the fields toil in their stead.

7. Since 1850 the population of the world has doubled; its indebtedness, chiefly for war purposes, has increased from eight billions to nearly thirty-five billions.

8. Armies take the very flower of youth. Did war consume the weaklings and criminals instead of the best workmen, perhaps something might be said for its "keeping down surplus population." It saps virility. Napoleon's wars, it is claimed, have left the French soldiers of to-day nearly two inches shorter than their ancestors.

9. Military equipments must be new. One may use an old sewing machine or reaper, but not a gun that is

out of date. A new invention turns millions of costly, burnished arms into old junk.

10. The constant increase of standing armies and navies, accomplishing no result but increased burdens on the people, means inevitable bankruptcy to nations that are our customers, unless a halt is soon called. Is it not time for thinking beings, who have abandoned tattooing, the eating of raw flesh and all other savage practices except organized slaughter, to take for their motto, "In time of peace prepare for permanent peace."

WORLD ORGANIZATION, THE WAY OUT.

The methods which achieved a United States must be used to achieve a United World. Less than one hundred statesmen in Philadelphia in 1787 worked out the method of getting peace and justice between fifty states that were to be. So that whatever feuds, riots or murders there may be *within* our States, there is no violence *between* the States. A comparatively small number of persons in the six leading powers is all that is needed to secure by similar means peace *between* nations, although civil strife may yet occur *within* those nations. International peace will be achieved long before race prejudice, corruption, licentiousness and riots cease. It need not wait for a change of human nature or the education and conversion of the whole world.

Business interests demand international law applied in an International Court. An international police must replace rival armies and navies.

In 1899 delegates of twenty-six nations at The Hague signed conventions relating to war and arbitration, investigation and mediation. As a consequence, within six years a Permanent Court of Arbitration had settled difficulties between more than a dozen nations; war between Great Britain and Russia was averted by investigation of the "Dogger bank affair," Russia paying \$350,000 to the families of the fishermen whom her guns had killed; and war between Russia and Japan was ended by President Roosevelt's mediation, made possible by a provision of the Hague Conference.

In 1907 the second Hague Conference assembled representatives of practically all the nations in the world; limited the scope of war; provided for a Prize Court and a World Court to deal with cases not by arbitration but by international law; arranged for settlement by arbitration of questions about contractual debts; and did other useful work. It arranged for a third Hague Conference, to be held about 1915.

4. Treaties pledging arbitration of every dispute have been signed by Holland and Denmark, Italy and Denmark, and all the Central American States with each other. More than sixty treaties of limited arbitration have been signed between different nations. The United States has signed such treaties with twelve nations.

All the Central American States agreed to the neutralization of Honduras in 1907. In 1908 the great powers on the Baltic and North Seas pledged themselves to respect each other's territoriality and to protect Norway from aggression. Neutralization of the Philippines by mutual agreement of the Powers, which could be had for the asking, would enable the United States to protect them from aggression when it grants their independence. This would diminish by one-half our need of a navy and save over \$60,000,000 annually for fighting ignorance and disease at home.

Love of war is decreasing, but reliance on huge armaments is seemingly increasing. Decreased danger is paradoxically accompanied by growth of the military spirit, for which the newspapers and the military class, jealous of their profession, are chiefly responsible. A college education is no guarantee that one knows anything about these practical questions of danger and defense — far more important for success as voter, editor or parent than dead languages or higher mathematics.

WHAT YOU CAN DO.

1. You can learn these facts and pass them along.
 2. You can join the American Peace Society, whose central office is 31 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass., by paying \$1.00 a year, which includes subscription to the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, the strong organ in America of internationalism. If you cannot spare \$1.00, you can send a post-card, ask for sample literature and application blanks, and try to get your friends to join.
 3. You can try to induce the church or club to which you belong to have at least one address annually given by some expert on internationalism.
 4. You can promote the observance of May 18, the anniversary of the opening of the first Hague Conference.
 5. You can interest yourself in the Intercollegiate Peace Association, whose Secretary is Mr. George Fulk, Cerro Gordo, Ill. This sorely needs funds, and a generous donor has promised to double every dollar given to it. You can also interest yourself in the new American School Peace League, Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, 378 Newbury Street, Boston, Secretary. Money contributed toward this will likewise be duplicated. It aims to promote through schools and the educational public the interests of international justice and fraternity.
 6. You can see that the following books, for sale by the American Peace Society, are put into your Public Library:
- | | |
|--|--------|
| "World Organization," R. L. Bridgman | \$0.65 |
| "Addresses on War," Sumner | .65 |
| "Discourses on War," Channing | .65 |
| "Moral Damage of War," Walsh | .90 |
| "Patriotism and the New Internationalism," a
manual for teachers, Lucia Ames Mead | .20 |
| "The Future of War," Bloch | .65 |
| "The Federation of the World," B. F. Trueblood . . | .75 |
| "Lay Down Your Arms," Baroness von Suttner . . | .65 |

The United States and Universal Peace.

BY GLENN PORTER WISHARD.

[At the second Interstate Oratorical Contest on Peace and Arbitration, held at De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind., May 16, under the auspices of the Intercollegiate Peace Association, Mr. Wishard of Northwestern University, whose oration we herewith print, won the first prize of \$75. — ED.]

Political and religious reforms move slowly. We change our beliefs and at the same time hold fast to old customs. Far-sighted public opinion has declared war to be unchristian; sound statesmanship has stamped it as unjust; the march of events has, in the majority of cases, proved it to be unnecessary, — and yet we continue to build mammoth engines of destruction as if war were inevitable. Truly, the millennium is not at hand, nor is war a thing of the past; but whereas war was once the rule, now it is the exception. This is an age of peace; controversies once decided by force are now

settled by arbitration; Europe, once the scene of continuous bloodshed, has not been plundered by conquering armies for more than a generation, while the United States has enjoyed a century of peace marred by only five years of foreign war. The four notable conflicts of the last decade have been between great and small powers; and have been confined to the outposts of civilization, while during the same period more than one hundred disputes have been settled by peaceful means. The willingness to arbitrate has been manifest; the means have been provided; the Permanent International Court, established by the Hague Conference in 1899, actually lives, and has already adjudicated four important controversies. But arbitration, you say, will never succeed because the decisions cannot be enforced. You forget that already some two hundred and fifty disputes have been settled by this method and in not one instance has the losing power refused to abide by the decision.

Yesterday the man who advocated universal peace was called a dreamer; to-day throughout the world organized public opinion demands the abolition of war. Yesterday we erected statues to those who died for their country; to-day we eulogize those who live for humanity. Yesterday we bowed our heads to the god of war; to-day we lift our hands to the Prince of Peace.

I do not mean to say that we have entered the utopian age, for the present international situation is a peculiar one, since we are at the same time blessed with peace and cursed with militarism. This is not an age of war, yet we are burdened by great and ever-increasing armaments; the mad race for naval supremacy continues; while the relative strength of the powers remains practically the same; the intense and useless rivalry of the nations goes on until, according to the great Russian economist, Jean de Bloch, it means "slow destruction in time of peace or swift destruction in the event of war." In Europe to-day millions are being robbed of the necessities of life, millions more are suffering the pangs of abject poverty, in order to support this so-called "armed peace." Note the condition in our own country. Last year we expended on our army, navy and pensions sixty-seven per cent. of our total receipts. Think of it! In a time of profound peace more than two-thirds of our entire expenditures are charged to the account of war.

We do not advocate radical utopian measures; we do not propose immediate disarmament; but we do maintain that when England, Germany, France and the United States each appropriate from thirty to forty per cent. of their total expenditures in preparation for war in an age of peace, the time has come for the unprejudiced consideration of the present international situation. Why do the great powers build so many battleships? President Roosevelt, Representative Hobson and others would have us believe that England, Germany and France are actually preparing for war, while the United States is building these engines of destruction for the purpose of securing peace. But what right have we to assume that our navy is for the purpose of preserving peace, while the navies of the European powers are for the purpose of making war? Is it not an insult to neighbors to make such an assumption? As a matter of fact, England builds new battleships because Germany does, Germany increases her navy because France does, while the United States builds new Dreadnaughts because the other nations